

Core Team/Stakeholders Committee Meeting

State Resource Strategy Meeting

December 17, 2009

Fernan Ranger Station, Idaho Panhandle National Forests

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Core Team Members attending in Coeur d'Alene

- Steve Kimball, Idaho Department of Lands/Forest Service
- Dave Stephenson, Idaho Department of Lands
- Ara Andrea, Idaho State Technical Committee (NRCS)
- Ed Warner, Idaho Department of Lands – Forest Legacy Program
- Bob Helmer, Idaho Department of Lands – Endowment Lands
- Frank Gariglio, USDA – Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Cindy Lane, Forest Service: Clearwater, Nez Perce/ Payette National Forests
- Mike Bowman, Idaho Community Forestry Advisory Council
- Serena Carlson, Intermountain Forest Association
- Chris Schnepf, University of Idaho Extension
- Kirk David, Idaho Forest Stewardship Advisory Committee
- Kurt Mettler, Coeur d'Alene Tribe

Core Team Member attending from Boise (NIFC):

- Bob Unnasch, The Nature Conservancy (joined at 10:00 am due to technical difficulties.)

Staff Attendees:

- Andrew Mock, Idaho Department of Lands; GIS Analyst
- Ed DeYoung, Idaho Department of Lands; GIS Analyst
- Jill Cobb, USDA Forest Service-IPNF and IDL, Note Taker

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda

The meeting began with introductions. Group reviewed the agenda and meeting objectives.

Meeting Objectives:

- 1) Agree on timeline/process
- 2) Identify priority areas
- 3) Identify Statewide goals/strategies

4) Identify additional work to complete between meetings

At the opening, Mike Bowman (Idaho Community Forestry Advisory Council) suggested that we dig deeper and get to the core of the issues and/or problems. We need to ensure we are clear with our terms and messages.

Steve Kimball talked about the national meeting that he and Dave recently attended. Our group is as far as anyone on the Resource Strategy. No state has finished the Strategy. Seven states (including ID) have finished the State Assessment. As a group, we need to identify our highest priority areas (landscapes, watersheds, towns, small unique areas, or other areas). By creating a five year strategy for those areas, it will help us focus and bring multiple funds together.

Resource Strategy Guidance: (Powerpoint): The strategy will enable us to leverage funds from state and federal sources. The Strategy will include a five year plan, which will include monitoring plans and adaptive management actions. Incorporate existing statewide plans (e.g. Assessment of Need/Legacy Plan, Wildlife Plans, County Wildfire Protection Plans). The effort is on a fast track timeline. By March, we should have a draft of the Strategy out for review/comment and the final document completed by June 10th.

The group had a brief discussion about how the Strategy will open up funding/grants opportunities to private landowners. It is critical that we keep the plan strategic and broad, not project specific. Steve reminded the group to remember that the Strategy is an iterative process and is to be updated periodically- perhaps each year.

Group thoughts: Mike Bowman expressed concern with markets and loss of timber industry. Group agreed that we need to prioritize work in focus areas. The strategy should serve as a springboard for groups to collaborate to create local partnerships.

Kirk David discussed the March Landowners conference in Moscow (Sponsored by Clearwater RC&D). Would the strategy be far enough to share at that meeting? We may consider staffing a booth to let people share their thought or possibly a short presentation.

Proposed Process and Timeline

The group reviewed the steps proposed to complete the Strategy:.

1) Identify Priority Areas

- 2) Identify Statewide Goals/Strategies: Use much of what we did last time as a starting point
- 3) Identify Goals/Strategies for Specific Priority Areas. Develop goals/strategies that are unique to those areas. Bring in more local expertise to develop these. This will take some time...use interviews and meetings outside of the Core Team meetings. Final document will use a matrix to show goals and strategies for each Priority Area.

Review/Finalize Criteria for Priority Areas

Priority areas are those areas with driving concerns or benefits. Look at the SAFR Final Map for high priority areas. Areas should be distinct and have multiple issues. Look at existing collaborative efforts and build on these. Priority Areas will have strong identities and value. Don't worry about exact boundaries. The areas can feather-out on maps to avoid absolute boundaries.

Identify Priority Areas

Fourteen possible Priority Areas were presented and narrowed down. New lines were drawn on the GIS layers during the meeting. We'll develop a preliminary proposal today and then get input from larger Stakeholder group. (Not looking at Rangelands or non-forest).

Priest Lake	Priest Lake initially was kept separate because the Selkirk range is a natural boundary. Group Thoughts: Lump Priest Lake and North Panhandle. The issues between the two areas are similar.
North Panhandle	Combine Priest Lake and North Panhandle. Keep name as "North Panhandle."
Coeur d'Alene Coeur d'Alene Basin	Keep CDA and Moscow separate. Change name to "Coeur d'Alene Basin."
Bitterroot Divide	We share the Bitterroot area with Montana and have similar issues-propose this as a multi-state area. Include from Wallace to Lolo Pass. Call it the "Bitterroot Divide."
Moscow -Palouse	Attach the eastern St Joe portion of the polygon to the Clearwater because of similarities. Rename "Moscow" area "Palouse" and keep as a separate area. Keep separate from the Bitterroot Area. Line would go on the watershed break between the St. Joe and

	Clearwater.
Clearwater St. Joe/Clearwater	Expand the polygon up to Stateline, Hwy 12. Lower Clearwater boundary is okay. Includes St. Joe and Clearwater. Rename to “St Joe/Clearwater.”
Hells Canyon/Cascade West Central Idaho	Could be divided out from Council/Cascade. Group thinks it needs to be cut north and south. Take Craig Mtns north to Lewiston. Generally divide at Salmon River. Rename the north portion “Camas Prairie.” Rename the south portion “West Central Idaho.”
Salmon-Lemhi-Pahsimeroi	FS Sups asked us to look more closely at beetle kill and fire. We don’t have good data on beetle kill. Rename this to “Lemhi-Pahsimeroi.”
Sun Valley Wood River.	FS Sups asked us to look more closely at beetle kill and fire. Rename to “Wood River.”
Greater Boise Boise River	Rename to “Boise River. “
Greater Idaho Falls Eastern Idaho Complex	Combined Idaho Falls and Pocatello and eastern-most portion of Snake River areas to create “Eastern Idaho Complex.”
Snake River Plain Complex	Polygons look okay. Rename to “Snake River Complex.”
Teton Westslope	Combine Island Park and Teton areas. “Teton Westslope” is the new name.
Greater Pocatello	Renamed and combined with Pocatello and Snake areas and now is “Eastern Idaho Complex.”
Island Park	Beetle Kill area. Combined with Teton and renamed as “Teton Westslope.”

Comments from Group:

Human Dimension: Need to address this with the Strategy.

Kirk David: Liked that there were groups of areas...lumped together.

Need to develop a simple presentation to convey the process to Stakeholders without all of the details.

Steve talked about discussion with Gov. Otter and Land Board. Gov. asked us to look at the area adjacent to the Frank Church wilderness. Lots of threats along the interface (e.g. noxious weeds and fire). Do we want to think about wilderness interface polygon? Response was that much of the wilderness is bordered by national forest lands. The SAFR addressed these issues. With identification of Priority Areas we'll look at some areas near wilderness that have been flagged as areas with multiple issues in our process.

Cindy Lane: Brought up discussion of critical transportation corridors like Hwy 12 and Interstate 90. We need to connect to the other state borders. Keep the integrity of the travel corridors.

Question raised about how we will interface with the tribes? We'll continue to work with key tribal contacts as we develop the Strategy.

Comment made that we need to review the Social analysis from ICBMP. David Stephenson responded that the data in ICBMP is more coarse than what we used.

Frank asked about looking at habitat type zones. Maybe group these larger? If there are similarities we could group for specific strategies?

Identify multi-state opportunities. Consider extending boundaries in northwest Idaho to include the Spokane River. Consider the Pend Oreille River, Montana and the Yak River drainages.

Looked at the southern-most polygons and discussed connecting the Grande Ronde to include Oregon. Decision is to not include this as a priority area at this time.

Treasure Valley/Boise area. Could we extend to Oregon? Decision is to not include this at this time.

Montana Wyoming Island Park and Yellowstone? Consider bumping along border along Centennial Mountains. Could this be shared with Greater Teton polygon? No decision made.

Look at Bitterroot National Forest. Most significant development pressure is along the northern boundary of the Salmon polygon.

Next Steps & Pework for Next Meeting

Steve asked the group to help brainstorm possible attendees to help us develop goals and strategies specific to each Priority Area.

January 28th: We will discuss two areas: Northern Panhandle and Coeur d'Alene. The following are potential attendees:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forest Capitol. Dave Gabrielson 2. David Brummer, Stimson, 3. Steve Funk, IFOA board, Wolf Lodge 4. Alan Harper , IFA 5. Kim Golden, RCD. 6. Soil and Water District Representative. 7. Al Kyle, IFOA 8. BLM, 9. Lon Merifield, IFOA 10. Land Trust Representative. Robin Miller or Chris De Forest or Ryan Loutty, Rob McCracken from Pend Oreille 11. Jeff Handle, Stakeholder Group 12. Priest River Development Corp, Liz Johnson Gebhardt 13. Planner IPNF, Art Zack 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Coeur D'alene Forest Coalition. Alan Harper. 15. Inland Empire Paper 16. Fish and Game: Mary Terra Burns or Chip Corsi 17. Tourism and economic development (Kim Golden) 18. City Planner 19. Congressional Rep 20. Riley Creek 21. Urban Forestry Representative 22. Shawn Keogh 23. Vince Rinaldy, county commissioner 24. Family Forestry Rep

Feb.18: Palouse, St Joe/Clearwater, Bitterroot Corridor; and Feb 19: Craig-Camas, West Central Idaho. The following are potential attendees:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SCD Representative 2. RC & D Representative 3. SCD Representative 4. FS 5. IDL 6. IDFG 7. State and Local Govt. 8. Known Collaboratives 9. County Commissioners 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Payette Nat. Forest 15. Valley County Rep. 16. County Wildfire 17. Nez Perce Tribe 18. Jeff Handle -Parks and Rec. 19. Hells Canyon Groups 20. Fish and Wildlife Service 21. Army Corp of Engineers 22. Clearwater Potlatch Timber Protection

10. State Trust Representative 11. Family Forest Owner 12. Clearwater economic development council 13. Clearwater Basin Cooperative meeting: Their next meeting is January 27 th . Steve can attend	Association 23. Montana DNR Rep. 24. Salmon River Outfitter and Guide: Water quality/weeds/tourism/fire
---	--

March 9: Boise River, Snake River Complex, Wood River; and March 10: Lemhi-Pahsimeroi, Teton-West Slope, Eastern Idaho Complex. The following are potential attendees:	
1. SCD Representative 2. RC & D Representative 3. SCD Representative 4. RC and D 5. FS 6. IDL 7. IDFG 8. State and Local Govt. 9. Known Collaboratives 10. County Commissioners 11. State Trust Representative 12. Family Forest Owner	13. Shoshone Bannock Tribe 14. Aspen Mgmt Group; 15. SITPA: Southern Idaho Timber Protection association 16. DEQ 17. BLM 18. IDWR 19. Lemhi Collaborative Group 20. Sawtooth Collaborative Group 21. Large Industrial Group 22. Law Enforcement Group (e.g. ATVs, marijuana) 23. Urban Forestry Representative

Where do we go from here and what do we want?

- At these follow up meetings, we should articulate issues, goals, strategies, stakeholders, resources, success and follow-up.
- Ask where we want to be in the next five years, desired future condition, educational needs, wildfire risk analysis.
- Discuss what we are trying to achieve (in less than 150 words) and why certain areas are highlighted in red/orange in the SAFR.

- We need to develop talking points and key questions. We will summarize the situation and ask for strategies from the attendees to help address these issues.
- Ask the reps if they can build on what we started, are their critical issues that we missed. What our SAFR says and what else is happening in these areas. Also what priorities do the representatives at the specific area meetings see?
- Need to address infrastructure (e.g. maintain and support mills). As pre-meetings consider more focused discussions with the property owners/timber interests. This would be separate from the larger meeting. Consider a discussion at the Forestry Forum and other opportunities that arise in the next several months.
- When looking at area-specific goals and strategies consider what are the goals for the area and what can we do to meet those goals? Looking at very broad strategies.
- As part of our homework, we need to have our members represent those wide varieties of issues. Keep Core Team Meetings at relative low numbers (these are core team working meetings). We need a process to query for answers. Need group to critique of goals and strategies.

Key Questions for pre-meetings (prior to upcoming area-specific meetings):

1. Are you aware of this process?
2. Explain how the Resource Strategy process began. Include: the states used to use “shotgun” requests for funding. However, given limited funding, the states need to be more effective in prioritizing work. Emphasize this is a partnership effort. Future funding is very competitive.
3. Show them the map of Priority Areas (without issues and level of concern identified) and ask them what strategies they know of for these areas? E.g. Collaborative groups, monitoring, feasibility study for infrastructure?
4. Which areas within this priority need the most attention and why?
5. What do they think would make the area a high priority for restoration and protection?
6. Review the list of issues: fire, urban interface, weeds, etc.
7. Ask who else we should be talking to in this area?
8. What do they think is the highest priority work given a very limited funding?
9. Are they aware of funding we can leverage?
10. What information do we need to make better decisions?
11. Are there areas of agreement and disagreement?
12. What else concerns you that we may have missed?

Consider sending out a questionnaire and follow up with phone calls to gather this information.

We will send out list of these contacts and see who can/wishes to help with contacts.

Need to figure out how we will measure to see if we are making progress. This is monitoring! What does "Follow up" mean? Are we going to meet every year? Are we going to keep some of these players involved in the grant process? Will we maintain a perpetual website? Should we establish some broad benchmarks to see if we have been successful (e.g. establishing collaborative groups)? We need to keep interviews on track to help with strategies and not actions. How will our measures of success be established? Comment that we need both people and resource components

We need to ask Stakeholders to look at our priority areas and provide feedback. Last Stakeholder meeting was in September and we should aim for another meeting in February. Hosting the Stakeholder and Core Team Meetings on the same day would be too much. Therefore, the Stakeholder meeting will be held on the afternoon of **Feb. 8th**. Consider inviting someone from the weather service to the Stakeholder meeting. Expand our knowledge base for weather predicting to the private. Big topic is unified service for landowners for weather and/or technology transfer.

Each of us needs to familiarize ourselves with existing plans: For example, the Idaho Dept of Fish and Game Wildlife Plan and the County Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP's) (Craig Glazier and Steve Kimball will review these) or the Land Trust Assessment of need (Ed will represent).

Critical Dates to Mark on the Calendar:

January 28th: Northern Panhandle and Coeur d'Alene Goals and Strategy Meeting

February 8th: Stakeholder meeting will be held on the afternoon

February 18th: Palouse, St Joe/Clearwater and Bitterroot Corridor Goals and Strategy Meeting.

February 19th: Craig-Camas and West Central Idaho Goals and Strategy Meeting

March 9th: Boise, Snake and Wood River Goals and Strategy Meeting

March 10th: Lemhi-Paseneroi, Teton-Westslope, Eastern Idaho Complex Goals and Strategy Meeting

Each of the Goals and Strategy meetings will begin at 9:00 am Pacific Time.

Notes Recorded by Jill Cobb and edited by Steve Kimball.